

## **REMARKS**

At page 3 of the office action, the Examiner alleges that the claim language "other molecules being chemically bondable to said functional compound when in said coating" is an intended use of the composition. This is not correct. The language is descriptive of a property which the functional compound possesses i.e., the ability to bind to other molecules.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 60 and 63 have been amended to recite "low self-fluorescent". Support for the amendments to claims 1, 60 and 63 can be found, for example, in original claim 3 and Example I at page 33 of applicants' specification. At page 5 and 6 of the Office Action the Examiner has indicated that the subject matter of claim 3 is allowable. Thus, it is believed that all rejections are overcome.

Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 24 is amended so as to avoid the need for antecedent basis for "biofunctional properties".

Claim 73 is amended to conform to the language of claim 63.

Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any unresolved matters.

## **REMARKS**

At page 3 of the office action, the Examiner alleges that the claim language "other molecules being chemically bondable to said functional compound when in said coating" is an intended use of the composition. This is not correct. The language is descriptive of a property which the functional compound possesses i.e., the ability to bind to other molecules.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 60 and 63 have been amended to recite "low self-fluorescent". Support for the amendments to claims 1, 60 and 63 can be found, for example, in original claim 3 and Example I at page 33 of applicants' specification. At page 5 and 6 of the Office Action the Examiner has indicated that the subject matter of claim 3 is allowable.

Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 24 is amended so as to avoid the need for antecedent basis for "biofunctional properties".

Claim 73 is amended to conform to the language of claim 63.

Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any unresolved matters.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration is courteously requested. If there are any issues which can be expeditiously resolved by a telephone conference, the examiner is courteously invited to telephone counsel at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Anthony Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

  
Jennifer Branigan, Reg. No. 40,921  
Agent for Applicant(s)  
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
(703) 812-5305  
Internet Address: [jbranigan@mwzb.com](mailto:jbranigan@mwzb.com)

Filed: 25 February 2005  
JJB:K:\Sgw\155\resp jan 05.doc